

1

2

3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5

6 MLC INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, LLC,  
7 Plaintiff,  
8 v.  
9 MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,  
10 Defendant.

Case No. [14-cv-03657-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING MLC'S FIRST  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 479

11

12 The Court has reviewed MLC's first<sup>1</sup> motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration  
13 of this Court's Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Micron's Motion to Strike Portions of  
14 the Lee Report, as well as Micron's response.

15

16 The Court generally agrees with Micron's analysis as stated in the response, and concludes  
17 that there is no reason to grant reconsideration. The Court found – and continues to find – that  
18 MLC's infringement contentions did not disclose *any* structure for the comparator, and did not  
19 disclose a theory that the memory cell could be the comparator. That finding was the basis for  
20 striking portions of the Lee Report regarding the memory cell-as-comparator theory. The Court  
21 discussed MLC's statements during claim construction to make the point that the Lee Report was  
the first time that MLC disclosed a theory under which the comparator could be a memory cell.

22

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23

Dated: May 24, 2019



SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge

24

25

27

28

<sup>1</sup> MLC has filed a second motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of a different portion of that order. Dkt. No. 558. The Court will issue a separate order regarding that motion.